INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
KOISO, Kuniaki (resumed)	32433
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Logan Cross (cont'd) by Dr. TAKAYANAGI Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Furness	32433 32438 32439
Redirect by Mr. Brooks	32443
MORNING RECESS	32458
Redirect (cont'd) by Mr. Brooks	32458
NOON RECESS	32474
Redirect (cont'd) by Mr. Brooks	32476
(Witness excused and returned to dock)	32476
TOKUGAWA, Yoshichika (resumed)	32477
Direct by Mr. Brooks	32477
(Witness excused)	32482
HIYOSHI, Takehiko	32486
Direct by Mr. Brooks	32486
("itness excused)	32493

5 NOVEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

Defense' Witnesses	Page
IWAKURO, Hideo	32494
Direct by Mr. Brooks	32494
AFTERNOON RECESS	32502
Direct (cont'd) by Hr. Brooks	32506
(Witness excused)	32508
KITANO, Kenzo	32509
Direct by Nr. Brooks	32509
(Witness excused)	32513
TOKUGAWA, Yoshitomo	32514
Direct by Mr. Brooks	32514
(Witness excused)	32517
TANAKA, Takeo	32518
Direct by Mr. Brooks	32518

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
2829	3383		Excerpt from Exhibit No. 3038-B - Study on the Organization of MP Force in Man- churia		32446
2043	3384		Affidavit of TOKUGAWA, Yoshichika	32483	
	3385		War Ministry General Affairs Regulations	32484	
2562	3385-4	1	Excerpt therefrom		32484
2560	3386		Affidavit of HIYOSHI, Takehiko		32488
2661	3386-4	1	Certificate of non- availability of docu- ments		32492
2567	3387		Affidavit of IWAKURO, Takeo		32502
2561	3388		Affidavit of KITANO, Kenzo		32510
2698	3388-A		Certificate of non- availability of docu- ments		32510
2563	3389		Affidavit of TOKUGAWA, Yoshitomo		32515

1 Wednesday, 5 November 1947 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with 13 the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member 14 from India, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE 15 JUSTICE HENRI BERNARD, Member from the Republic of France, not sitting from 1100 to 1600. 16 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 19 (English to Japanese and Japanese 20 to English interpretation was made by the 21 Language Section, IMTFE.) 22 23 24 25

No.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

KOISO

G e n b e g 8 Y n

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel. prison surgeon at Sugamo certifies that he is too ill to be able to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Have you completed your cross-examination, Colonel?

COLONEL FIXEL: I made a statement at the conclusion of yesterday's proceeding that the prosecution had completed its cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please.

15

16

17

18

19

KUNIAKI KOISO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

21

BY MR. LOGAN:

22

General KOISO, the prosecution asked you some questions the day before yesterday on pages 32,277 and 32,278 of the record with respect to a conversation you are supposed to have had with the accused KIDO; do you recall that? That was to the effect that you are

20

23

4

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

19

20 21

2223

24

25

supposed to have told KIDO that you seemed to be in favor of a HIRANUMA Cabinet in April or May, 1932.

A I have no recollection as having ever said that directly to Marquis KIDO.

Q And the prosecution also referred to a diary entry of Marquis KIDO of May 17, 1932, apparently to back up the questions they were asking you. Now, in that diary entry Marquis KIDO records that Lieutenant Colonel SUZUKI told him that War Vice Minister KOISO seems to be in favor of a HIRANUMA Cabinet. Did you have such a conversation with Lieutenant Colonel SUZUKI or with someone who might have told him that?

A I have no such recollection.

Q No recollection of having talked to Lieutenant Colonel SUZUKI or no recollection of having said that you were in favor of a HIRANUMA Cabinet to any person?

A I have no recollection of ever having said that, but at the same time I cannot say that I absolutely did not say such a thing.

Q On page 32,281 of the record you state that KIDO's diary, court exhibit 179-F, is completely without foundation. That exhibit is a diary of August 7, 1931, in which KIDO is reporting information which Baron HARADA gave him. When you say that that exhibit is completely without foundation do you mean by that

1 +

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

the contents of the diary for that date do not properly portray or set forth what Baron HARADA told KIDO or do you mean by that that the information which Baron HARADA transmitted to KIDO is inaccurate?

A If I am to explain to you a part of this in some detail, the contents of exhibit 179, I should tell you that this entry says or alleges that KOISO, NINOMIYA and TATEKAWA had held a meeting at the official residence of the War Minister and, using one HASHIMOTO, Shigeto as sort of a tool and inviting the services of Dr. OKAWA, were planning to utilize the Social Masses Party to carry out a political change.

Q General, I don't like to interrupt you but I think that is beside the point. This exhibit is in evidence and sets forth this conversation which KIDO had with Baron HARADA.

MR. BROOKS: I would like for the witness to complete the answer he started, if your Honor please.

MR. LOGAN: This is cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: I did not understand it, as far as he went, to be an answer to the question put, so put your question.

Q All I am interested in, General, is when you state that this exhibit is completely without foundation,

 do you mean by that that the information which Baron HARADA gave Marquis KIDO was not correct?

A I do not know the source but I deny the facts as set forth -- alleged there.

THE PRESIDENT: That is as much as he could say.

Q But you have no quarrel, General, with the facts as recorded by Marquis KIDO as having come from Baron MARADA, have you? In other words, you do not deny that Baron HARADA told KIDO what he records in his diary?

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I ask that the witness be allowed to explain his answer which he had started to do before, having answered the question giving his reasons why he denies those facts.

MR. LOGAN: I am not cross-examining this witness as to the truth or falsity of those facts.

I am merely cross-examining to find out whether or not he denies that HARADA told KIDO what is recorded in his diary; that is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Let him answer, but we know what it is going to be.

A I cannot deny that.

MR. LOGAN: That is all.

```
MR. TAKAYANAGI: I wish to conduct a brief
 1
     cross-examination for defendant SUZUKI.
 2
 3
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
.19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY .R. TAKAYANAGI:

Q When the witness was Chief of the military Affairs Bureau, was there another person by the name of SUZUKI besides defendant SUZUKI in the military Administration Section of the Bureau?

A After I testified yesterday I discovered later, on second thought, that there was one more SUZUKI in the military Administration Section.

Q The SUZUKI who is not the defendant SUZUKI, what is his first name?

A The name was SUZUKI, Sosaku.

Q Then with regard to the stamp or the seal on Court exhibit 3377, is it not unclear whether that stamp is of defendant SUZUKI or not?

THE MONITOR: That seal is.

A Before replying to that question, I should like to state to the Tribunal, if I may, that yesterday I said that the seal on the document was that of the accused SUZUKI. That was a hasty remark on my part, and I should like at this time to make an apology.

THE MONITOR: Hasty and careless.

A (Continuing) In the Military Administration Section the accused SUZUKI was in charge of manchurian problems, but questions pertaining to military organi-

2

4 5

_

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

25

zation were in the hands of SUZUKI, Sosaku. Therefore, I think that the seal "SUZUKI" on the document may have been the seal of SUZUKI, Sosaku.

MR. TAKAYANAGI: That's all.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY LR. FURNESS:

Q General KOISO, when did you become commander of the Korean Army?

A The 2nd of December, 1935.

Q You testified that the total strength of the Korean Army at the time that you took command was approximately twenty thousand. Was this strength increased at all prior to the Changkufeng Incident?

A About one year prior to the outbreak of the Changkufeng Incident the strength very greatly deteriorated -- decreased.

O Between the time of that decrease -- and what -- did it decrease to?

A With the outbreak of the China Incident the 20th Division was brought under the command of the China Garrison Forces, and the unit remaining in Korea became a unit in absentia. Although I have no clear recollection as to the figures, I think the decrease was by some five to six thousand.

Q Was it, after that decrease, increased at all

1

5

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

prior to the time that you were transferred?

After the reduction a reorganization of the border guards was carried out, and I think there was an increase of from five to six hundred.

And that reorganization brought up two battalions, is that correct?

There was a reduction in two battalions -strike that, please. Two battalions were reduced or eliminated and three new battalions were created, so I think there was a net increase of one battalion.

And when was that done?

A I have no clear recollection, but it may have been in 1936 or possibly in 1937.

Q You testified that on July 3 Soviet cavalrymen were seen on the crest of Changkufeng Hill, that they were increased on the 11th, and by the 13th forty were observed on the crest of the hill. Had any Soviet troops been reported in that area prior to July, 1938?

Prior to that, there had never been any stationary Soviet troops in that vicinity.

Q You testified that you received reports that Soviet troops were engaged in construction work on the 11th and 13th days of July, 1938. What sort of construction work was reported?

In my recollection, it was that the Soviet troops were digging trenches on the slope of the -in Manchurian territory.

Q You mean on the western slope of Hill Changkufeng?

A Yes, that is what it would amount to.

? I'll pass to another subject.

on pages 32,429 and 32,430 you testified about certain actions relating to French Indo-China. As Prime Minister at that time, were you aware that De Gaulle, the head of the Provisional Government of France, which had been recognized by the Allies, which Allies were at war with Japan, had announced over Radio France on the 29th of August, 1944 that France had been at war with Japan since 8 December, 1941?

A No, I did not know anything about the broad-cast.

M & W h

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Had you been advised as Prime Minister that the Provisional Government of France had declared France was at war with Japan? I mean at the time that those actions were taken by the Japanese in 1945 regarding which you have testified.

CROSS

At the Supreme Council for the Direction of War Foreign Minister SHIGEMITSU explained that even before the DeGaulle Regime had returned, or entered France, while it was still in Africa, it had declared war against Japan, and that even after its return to France that situation had not in any way changed.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. UZAWA.

DR. UZAWA: I am Counselor UZAWA. In view of the fact that counsel for SHIRATORI is absent I should like to conduct a cross-examination in his place, or direct examination. I wish to ask the Court's permission.

THE PRESIDENT: Where is SHIRATORI's counsel? DR. UZAWA: I think that in view of the fact that the transportation conditions on the electric tram cars are not good, he was not able to be here at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we need some substantial reason for permitting the change, Doctor.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, if it is

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

direct examination it should follow my examination, and that may give him a little further time under our rules.

DR. UZAWA: May I proceed with direct examina-

THE PRESIDENT: Not now. I think Captain

Brooks' suggestion is a good one actually, and your

examination will be direct and not cross-examination -
redirect.

Captain Brooks.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MA. BROOKS:

Q While you were in the Wer Ministry as the Chief of the Military Affairs Brueau, or as the Vice-Minister, did you ever have a look at the so-called secret diaries of the War Ministry?

A I have never seen this so-called great secret diary as compiled.

Now, was there, or is there any sign, seal, or otherwise on the documents filed in these secret diaries to show whether or not you or your superiors, either Vice-Minister or War Minister, ever had a look at them?

A Yes, distinctions can be made for, on inspection of any document, it can be noticed whether there

.

11

10

6

7

9

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are

3

4

6

8

10

12

13

15 16

17 18

> 19 20

21

23

25

are any notations or markings indicating whether a particular person has seen the document or not.

Q Give us some examples of that, if you please, indicate what kind of a distinction or sign or mark?

A A seal or a signature.

Q That was routine procedure for documents that had been examined by any member of the War Ministry to notify his reading or looking at that document by placing his seal or signature on it, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Were there or were there not documents filed in the secret diaries which were not brought to the notice of yourself or to your superiors?

A The two documents which I saw yesterday did not indicate that I nor the Vice-Minister nor the War Minister had seen them.

Q By that answer you mean there was no signature nor seal placed upon them showing that they had been submitted for your examination?

A That is so.

Q Do you know of any reason why such documents that you have just referred to were not shown to you, or that you did not see them?

A Of course, there are various reasons, but in most cases when any matter is not adopted in the

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23

22

24 25

lower levels and the matter is abandoned there, then the matter is finished after an oral report has been made of the outline. It indicates that the matter had been disposed of in the lower levels and had not been submitted to the higher levels for any advice. .

MR. BROOKS: May the witness be shown the original of exhibit 3376? I believe that is an excerpt from exhibit 3038-B.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

MR. BROOKS: Also give the witness the Japanese copy of exhibit 3376.

THE PRESIDENT: Are any steps being taken to get in touch with SHIKATORI's counsel?

Proceed, Captain.

Q Witness, look at the middle of the ninth sheet of the text, excluding the covers, of the socalled "Study on the Organization of Military Police Force in Manchuria." Will you find there the sentence: "The basis of determination of the number of military police force in Manchuria on the peace time footing will be as follows"?

MR. BROOKS: Will you also give the witness defense document 2829?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to

the witness.)

1

Can you find that place?

3

I haven't found the place yet.

4

MR. BROOKS: I will have the Marshal hand

5

you a Japanese copy of the defense document 2829 which you can compare to find the place. It is in the middle of the ninth sheet on the back side of the text of

7

6

the Japanese original. This paragraph starts --

8 9

A Yes, I have found the place.

10

11

And you find the sentence that I have read to you there that appears in defense document 2829?

12

May I have the defense document number re-

13 14 peated?

15

16

The one you have in your hand. Starting with the words: "The basis of determination of the number of military police force in Manchuria on the peace time footing will be as follows."

17 18

I know now.

19 20

MR. BROOKS: I offer defense document 2829

21 22 as a supplement to IPS document No. 3203, which is exhibit 3376, an excerpt from exhibit 3038-B. These

23

are part of the unread portions from which the exhibit 3376 is an excerpt.

24

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2829

will receive exhibit No. 3383.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3383, and received in evidence.)

```
MR. BROOKS: I will read paragraphs 1, 2, and
   3 and then the last paragraph of this document. I think
  simultaneous translation has been provided;
           "The basis of determination of the number of MP
  force in Manchuria on the peace time footing will be as
  follows:
            "To satisfy the war-time requirement of men.
7
            "To cause no hindrance to the peace-time business
  of MP.
            "To maintain harmony between the peace-time
10
11
  (organization) and the war-time (organization).
12
            "For the above purpose, we have prepared a plan
13
  of organization, the gist of which is as follows:
14
            "(Details are shown in Table III attached hereto,
15
            "Headquarters of MP in Manchuria (at Mukden).
            "Kwantung MP Unit: Port Arthur Section, Dairen
17
  Section, Tashichao Section, Yiukon Section: approximate-
18
  ly 200 men including chiefs."
19
           That should be spelled y-i-u-k-o-w.
20
           THE PRESIDENT: I am told it should be
21
  y-i-n-k-o-w.
22
           MR. BROOKS: Y-i-n, that is right; Yinkow,
23
24 y-i-n-k-o-w.
           "Mukden MP Init: Mukden, Liaoyan, Fushun,
25
  Lieushenkuan, Antung: approximately 300 men including
```

chiefs.

"Chanchun MP Unit (At Chanchun): Suupingai, Tielin, Kungchuling, Chanchun: approximately 400 men including chiefs.

"Independent MP Battalion (at Mukden): 1st Section, 2nd Section: approximately 400 men including chiefs.

"As to the Independent MP (Battalion) in this table, the men will be first enlisted in other branch services for about 6 months and then joined in the service (of MP) for about one year. The bilateral system of conscription and volunteering will be adopted, following the example of the Navy. After one year and half of enlistment, that is to say, at the time of release from the MP Battalion, a number of the men will be posted as corporals in the Section. In other words, the Battalion will become an educational organ of MP. The Units other than the Independent Battalion will be active service organs, the system of which is more or less similar to the present one.

"(2) According to the (plan of) organization above mentioned, we shall be able to command active MPs of approximately 400 men and educated MPs of approximately 400 men, the total of which will supply 1,100 MPs annually, although their quality may vary in

some degree. Furthermore, the number of men released annually from each MP Unit will be recruited from the Independent Battalion, while the Independent Battalion ill release those who are not sent to each Unit as recruits, thereby acquiring 400 MPs on reserve annually. After 10 years, approximately 4,700 MPs will be supplied by the total of 4,000 men, 400 multiplied by 10, (on reserve) and 700 men on active service. In the 11th year, approximately 5,000 men will be secured by adding 4,400 and 700. Supposing that these men released from the Independent MP Battalion get the same limit of service years as ordinary conscripts, we shall be able to supply 7,000 MPs at all times during the period of 14 or 15 years of the first and second reserve services. Considering the rate of decrease therefrom as 15% and the addition of NCOs (of MP) after the maturity of the

"Thus, ten or more years are required to supply 5,000 MPs. In order to supplement MP force until then, we must, first of all, fill up the number of 1,100 of active service MPs by the proposed amendment of the organization and adopt the system of temporary transfer of branch services to recruit the annual deficiency. For such purpose and in case of

second reserve service, the total number will not

1 2

5

3

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17

18 19

exceed 6,000 men.

20 21

22 23

2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

some degree. Furthermore, the number of men released annually from each MP Unit will be recruited from the Independent Battalion, while the Independent Battalion ill release those who are not sent to each Unit as recruits, thereby acquiring 400 MFs on reserve annually. After 10 years, approximately 4,700 MPs will be supplied by the total of 4,000 men, 400 multiplied by 10, (on reserve) and 700 men on active service. In the 11th year, approximately 5,000 men will be secured by adding 4,400 and 700. Supposing that these men released from the Independent MP Battalion get the same limit of service years as ordinary conscripts, we shall be able to supply 7,000 MPs at all times during the period of 14 or 15 years of the first and second reserve services. Considering the rate of decrease therefrom as 15% and the addition of NCOs (of MP) after the maturity of the second reserve service, the total number will not exceed 6,000 men.

"Thus, ten or more years are required to supply 5,000 MPs. In order to supplement MP force until then, we must, first of all, fill up the number of 1,100 of active service MPs by the proposed amendment of the organization and adopt the system of temporary transfer of branch services to recruit the annual deficiency. For such purpose and in case of

.

need, temporary laws and regulations should be issued to cover the deficiency by means of the transfer of branch services."

Paragraphs 4 and 5 are omitted. I think part of that is in prosecution document 3376.

"We have, in the above, arrived at a plan of organization in peace-time by discussing the number of men required at war-time. Many aspects of the present condition of MP at home and abroad will not meet the demand of operation in future. The same will apply to MP Units in Korea and Japan proper. "e must, therefore, make further study and investigation and prepare a satisfactory solution for the harmony between the peace-time (organization) and the war-time (organization)!

BY MR. BROOKS (Continued):

Q Now, Mr. Witness, what if anything do you have to say about exhibit 3376 and the supplement thereto, exhibit 3383? Do you have any further explanation of those documents?

A Then I will say a word. As the seal on this document indicates, I did not see the document at the time, but I recall that Colonel ANDO, Chief of the Military Service Section, gave me an oral report on the outline of this plan at the time. My recollection of the gist of the report is this: Colonel ANDO said

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

that Major General MINE, commander of the MPs, had submitted his personal views on a matter the object of which was to bring about an expansion of the Kempeitai. Colonel ANDO further said that this was MINE's own idea and a highly fantastic one and impossible of execution. He then concluded his report, saying that such being the case he was not going to submit the matter to the Chief of the Willitary Affairs Bureau. Than this matter wasn't -- this draft wasn't carried into action. Is that the interpretation of

your statement?

No, it wasn't carried into action.

And, as I understand, was shelved by the Military Police Section, is that correct?

A No, it was completely shelved and abandoned by the Military Service Section.

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Duda & Spratt

MR. BROOKS: Service section.

Now, may the witness see exhibit 3377.

If your Honors please, I have only had time to make a cursory examination of these later documents. The one I have just passed is the only one I have had a chance to thoroughly go into. There are a few errors I have picked up that I would call to the Court's attention, but there may be more.

Q This exhibit, Mr. Witness, appears to be from the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, MIYAKE, to SUGIYAMA, Vice-Minister of War. In the certificate it states, it refers to matters of sending of documents in regard to the draft plan for the current transitory organization in regard to the policy towards Manchuria and Mongolia. Now, I notice the day of its receipt is December 9, 1931. This is just one day prior to the resignation of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet. That is correct, is it not?

A Yes.

Q And the War Minister, MINAMI, resigned, that is the next day, on the 10th of December, 1931?

A Yes.

Q Now, what, if anything, do you have to say in relation to this document?

A As I stated to the Court yesterday, this

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

document was certainly prepared by the Kwantung Army, but there is nothing to indicate that the War Minister or the Vice-Minister or the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau saw this document.

Then this draft plan or temporary system proposed by the Kwantung Army was handled by lower sections of the War Ministry; is that correct?

Can you tell whether it was ever put into effect or any further action taken upon the proposed plan?

As far as the War Ministry authorities were concerned no directives of the kind were issued, but I do not know whether the Kwantung Army itself took any steps as are set forth in the plan indicated in this document.

IR. BROOKS: Now, may the witness see exhibit 3378-A.

If the Tribunal please, I wish to refer this exhibit 3378-A to the Language Arbitration Board to check the document, as there appear to wo matters in the English copy covered by whole paragraphs that do not appear in the Japanese original document.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we invite you to point out the latent deficiencies to Captain Kraft. You need not indicate them here, Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: A few examples are the last paragraph of page 8, the entire pages 9 and 10, and other mistakes in translation that I think call for a complete revision of the document.

MR. BROOKS: A few examples are the last paragraph of page 8, the entire pages 9 and 10, and other mistakes in translation that I think call for a complete revision of the document.

.....

25.

Japanese original of this exhibit 3378-A, does it provide control of civil administration, or only military administration?

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Fixel.

COLONEL FIXEL: I submit, if the Tribunal please, that the document should speak for itself, and the interpretation of the language would be a matter for the Tribunal rather than for the witness.

MR. BROOKS: I asked the witness on the Japanese original. This document in English overspeaks for itself; that is my complaint.

THE PRESIDENT: Then the matter is not for the witness, but for the arbitration board.

MR. BROOKS: I might also add, your Honor, that I wish also for him to point -- if there was any control of civil administration, he could point it out. It may save our recalling the witness later on.

THE PRESIDENT: We cannot permit him to perform our task for us.

MR. BROOKS: I was asking him to explain what is in the Japanese document, which I do not know and the Court does not know and apparently the prosecution does not.

THE PRESIDENT: If the English of this exhibit

5

6

9

10 .11

> 12 13

14 15

17

16

19 20

18

21

22

23

25

24

you are re-examining on is faulty, we should have it corrected at once and postpone your redirect examination until we have the corrected version. other course.

MR. BROOKS: We can do that, your Honor; however, I believe I would be satisfied with the answer to this question and not have to recall him later on, to save time.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is objected to and we must deal with it on its merits.

MR. BROOKS: Possibly I can withdraw the question and reframe it in a manner that would not be objectionable.

Q What control, if any, can you point out of civil administration as set out in this document?

What is written here in this document pertains to Gunseibu, or a Military Administration Department, an organization which is identical with what was in our country the Ministry of War and the Ministry of the Navy. And, therefore, such an agency was not permitted to engage in any form of civil administration; and, therefore, it is only natural that anything pertaining to civil administration would not be included here. And as a matter of fact, there is nothing pertaining to civil administration in this document.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 1 minutes. 2 (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was 3 taken until 1100, after which the proceedings 4 were resumed as follows:) 5 6 MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International W 8 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks. 9 & 10 BY MR. BROOKS (Continued): L Q Have you finished your answer, Witness, on efi this exhibit? 12 13 A Yes. MR. BROOKS: May the witness be shown exhibit 14 15 3379-A. 16 (Whereupon, a document was handed 17 to the witness.) 18 This appears to be a draft of an outline of 19 general measures regarding customs duties in Manchukuo, 20 dated December 12, 1932. What, if anything, do you 21 have to say about this exhibit? 22 No, I have nothing to say.

(The witness examined the document.)

(Continuing) May I ask now, Mr. Witness, was

Q Did you see it?

23

24

this draft or plan sent by you, as Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army? Does it represent your opinion, or was it sent as part of your administrative duties?

A This was an opinion set forth by one SUZUKI, Boku, a financial and economic adviser attached to the Kwantung Army Headquarters, to the -- and submitted to the commanding general of the Kwantung Army. This plan was adopted by the commanding general of the Kwantung Army and was sent in my name to the Central Army Authorities.

Q Had there been any previous study by the Central Army Authorities on this matter, and had they requested your observations from the field? When I say "your observations," I mean the observations, of course, of the Kwantung Army.

A With regard to the customs question of Manchukuo, nothing had been decided upon by the Central
Authorities at the time I left Tokyo to assume my
post as Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army in August,
1932, and the reason was that relations with the
Third Powers were very delicate at that time.
Generally, that was the reason.

I have no recollection that any requests
were made by the Central Authorities in connection
with this question following my assumption of office

in the Kwantung Army.

Q I direct your attention to the document, at the top of page 3 of the English text, under the words "Top Secret /stamp/," there is stated, "Now in study." Can you explain what that means?

A Yes.

Q Do so, please.

A As I have said, the Third Power relations in connection with the customs question was delicate at the time, and, for instance, if the commanding general of the Kwantung Army accepted opinions submitted to him by the adviser and formulated a plan of this sort, even then there was considerable room for further study, because it was not known whether such a plan could immediately be put into practice.

Q Do you know whether this plan was ever actually put in practice?

A As I have said before, I do not recall.

MR. BROOKS: I ask that the witness be shown exhibit 3380-A.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q What, if anything, do you have to say about this document?

A There is nothing special to mention.

2

4

3

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Was it sent by you, as Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, as one of your administrative duties?

A This document, as I said yesterday, was somewhat in the form of a reply to an inquiry made by the Central Authorithes of the Kwantung Army in connection with various laws and regulations, and this reply, supposed to be made by the commanding general of the Kwantung Army, was sent in the name of the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army.

Q That was the customary procedure, to send from the Chief of Staff to the Vice War Minister, was it not?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And, it was also customary procedure, when a direct communication with the War Minister, to send it direct from the commanding general, is that true, depending upon the importance of the communication?

A Yes, as you say.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness see exhibit 3381-A.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q This relates to the funds of the Kwantung Army. These funds were for the use of the army, were they not?

0

.

A Yes, as you say.

Q And, were handled in the same manner as you have testified to in relation to other funds sent on another occasion?

A Such procedures were taken by the Central Authorities when funds of this kind were sent to the Kwantung Army.

1.4

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

22 23

24

25

These funds were used for the same purposes and under the same procedure as described in your affidavit, were they not, in relation to the amounts that had been sent at other periods?

Yes. A

MR. BROOKS: Now, may the witness be shown exhibit 3382.

I believe that the Language Section has that, your Honor, at this time. I had asked him to make a check on the translators' notes that appeared on there, which I understand do not appear in the original, and ask for their interpretation of those Japanese phrases.

Is the Language Board ready to report on that at this time?

I understand they are not.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the accused's speech on the 17th of February, 1940, in the Diet -- the Budget Committee.

MR. BROOKS: IPS document No. 3030-N, exhibit The questions which I wish to submit to the 3382. Language Board are interpretations of Hakko-Ichiu, Tengyo-Kaiko and Rikigo-Kento. Translators' notes appearing in this document I think should be stricken from the document because they do not appear in the

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

original form, and if the Court wants it translated,

it should be done by the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Any dispute will be settled by the Language Arbitration Board.

MR. BROOKS: I wish the Court would consider my application to strike the two translators' notes that appear there as not being proper.

BY MR. BROOKS (Continued):

Q Now, Mr. Witness, do you have anything to say in relation to this exhibit, 3382?

A I have not.

Q The movements you have discussed in this speech were for development. Did they consider economic development or economic intercourse between the nations alone?

A No, that was not included, but the meaning was peaceful economic development primarily.

Q Then, your statement was directed, rather, at the population problem, was it not?

A The population problem was secondary. The primary question was that of economic expansion or development.

Q And why was it necessary for this economic expansion?

A Of course, the question is related to the

ř ·

population question, but Japan could not, by the produce of her own territory, her land -- could not maintain self-sufficiency. The principal method for Japan to survive was to import raw materials from outside sources, to process them and to increase the manufacturing capacity of such materials; and by exporting these products of Japanese industry, to procure by trade all the necessities of life in Japan, both raw material and otherwise.

Q Could she import such materials at this time without restriction?

A Yes.

Q Were there any countries at this time with which she could not do business?

A February 17, 1940, happened to be the time when the YONAI Cabinet was in office. At the time of the previous HIRANUMA Cabinet -- two cabinets previous -- that is to say, at the time of the HIRANUMA Cabinet, I recall that various restrictions were placed, economically and on trade by the United States.

Q Then, there were some restrictions that were causing Japan to seek products from new sources, is that not true?

A Among all the raw materials of which there was a severe shortage in Japan, and what was most the

center of discussion in connection with raw materials necessary for defense, was the question concerning oil.

Q Was that for military purposes alone?

. .,..

A No.

Q Was the military percentage of such oil needed, a minor amount or a maximum amount of the total needs?

A In the Navy I think there was a considerable need, but I have no knowledge of the figures.

Q At this time there was much discussion pro and con among the ministers of State and representatives as to how to meet this problem, was there not?

A The Members of Parliament, as I have indicated, have, based on the view to which I already referred, made many repeated demands upon the Government to bend more efforts so as to enable Japan to secure -- to obtain necessary raw materials from South Pacific areas through trade.

Kapleau & Knapp

Q Was a decision reached at this time on how to meet this problem, and if so, what was it?

THE INTERPRETER: To the witness' previous reply there should be added, after "necessary raw materials," "chiefly petroleum."

A There is nothing special -- no special steps were taken by the YONAI Cabinet, but in my recollection representatives in the field, that is to say, consul generals were conducting negotiations with the authorities -- competent authorities of the other countries.

MR. BROOKS: I refer the Court to paragraph 20 of exhibit 3375, the witness' affidavit, as to the Lake Khassan incident, and to page 22,751 of the record as to the witness TANAKA's statement.

I desire to read the question and answer which are set forth, that appear at page 22,751, and ask a question on it.

Question to TANAKA, the witness: "And what commanding general of the army issued the order about the concentration of troops, KOISO or NAKAMURA?"

The NAKAMURA referred to there, General KOISO, was the man that succeeded you on the 15th of July, 1938, was he not?

A Yes.

Q TANAKA's answer: "I did not see any of these

15

9

10

11

12

13

14

• 16

17

19

20

22

23

24

1

5

4

7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

documents directly or myself at the divisional headquarters, but judging from common military knowledge I would say that the order for concentration was naturally given by Commander of the Army KOISO. I should like to add that this was not an order for attack; it was an order to concentrate."

Now, that is the man that you referred to in paragraph 20 of your affidavit, is it not, General KOIFO?

Yes, that is so.

Now, in relation to paragraph 22 of your affidavit, about your meeting with Ott, do you know whether Ott knew of your opposition in the past to the Tripartite Pact?

A Well, I do not know whether Ambassador Ott actually knew or not that I was opposed, but in view of the fact that Ott had many frequent social contacts with army officers, I would judge that he might have been informed by these army officers of my opposition, and knew what my feelings were on the subject, but this is only my own imagination based on the fact that he had close intercourse with army officers.

In your affidavit vou stated that you thought he was confusing you as Overseas Minister with the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Now, thinking back on

á

this, might he not also have had this knowledge and been trying to influence your decisions for the future? I mean, of course, knowledge of your opposition to the Tripartite Pact.

COLONEL FIXEL: The prosecution objects to the question on the ground that it is leading, and also is highly speculative. The answer could not be based on any information that the witness would have.

MR. BROOKS: I will withdraw that question and ask it this way:

Q Was there any action or statement by Ott that now, thinking back on it, would lead you to think that he might be trying to influence your decisions in the future?

A When at these interviews with -- at this interview with Ott at least I considered that he, being an ambassador of a foreign power, would know what the real nature and character of the Ministry of Overseas Affairs was. Although I am not familiar with the English language the ministry over which I presided was called, in English, the Ministry for Overseas Affairs, and probably it is because of some connotation in that title that he asked questions of me which he should, if he knew the distinction properly, address to the Foreign Minister.

According to Ott's telegram, it is represented

that I, KOIFO, invited him, but the fact was the other way around; he invited or he initiated this interview with me, and I entertained doubts to the reason why he would invite me to an interview.

At that time, that is to say at the time of my interview with Ott, that was all that I thought, and entertained some doubts as to the purpose of his wanting to meet me, but after this Tribunal opened there was some telegram offered in evidence, sent by Ribbentrop to Ctt, to the effect that various moves should be taken in Japan to build up a political situation -- a political atmosphere in Japan as would desire -- create the desire among the Japanese to enter into an alliance with Germany, it came to -- it occurred to my mind that perhaps the teletraphic instruction from Ribbentrop to Ott included me as one of the targets to be utilized for the German purpose.

Now, Mr. Witness, in paragraph 25 you des-0 cribe the action taken in relation to French Indo-China. "as this action taken after approval from the French authorities under an agreement with the Vichy Government?

The pact of common defense was entered into between Japan and French Indo-China, the latter being represented by Governor General De Coux, who was acting under the directions of the Vichy Government. Then I assumed the prime Ministership it appeared that De Coux had entered into De Gaulle's camp, and in connection with the effectuation of the pact for common defense between Japan and French Indo-China. the French Indo-China authorities were showing a very non-cooperative attitude. I knew that this was the situation when I assumed the Prime Ministership, and at that time, in the light of the changing military situation, the decision of the Supreme Council for the consideration of war, of February 1, was taken.

Now, as to this decision of the Supreme Command, that was within their competence and you had no connection therewith or responsibility therefor, is that correct?

Being one of the composite members of the 25 Supreme Council for the consideration of war, I con-

1 3

9

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 10

20

21

4

5

6 7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

22

21

23

24

25

sider that any decision made by the Council -- I consider that I would be one of those responsible for any decision reached by that Council.

I am talking of the move of the Supreme Command for taking certain measures of security in this area. You would have no connection or responsibility for such security measures as they might see fit to take, as it would be in their competence entirely as a military operation, is that not correct?

I have no responsibilities in connection with High Command matters taken to carry out any policy on the spot.

Now, in relation to these dummy bombs and fireworks of the March Incident, how large was this package? Did you ever see it?

A I have never seen the package, but from what I have heard the amount was so small -- the amount was such that it could be carried in one suitcase and not more than two suitcases. My explanations seem to have been insufficient, but I was speaking of space sufficient to hold 300 shots.

You heard a witness testify here as to the size of the package as being handed from the train to one of OKAWA's followers. In describing it he said a man could easily carry that package of 300 bombs.

32,473

That was a correct statement, was it not?

A Ves, that is so, but from what I have read it wasn't a train but a city tram car.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: From what I 5 have heard it wasn't a train but a city tram car.

Q I will take your correction on that: I am not sure myself.

Anyway, it would not take an army truck to move these paper bombs?

A No, there was absolutely no such necessity.

O And they were not of such a nature that they would blow up the Diet building or cause any destruction of that nature, were they?

A It had no such power.

Now, in answer to one of Mr. Logan's questions you said -- I think the last question -- that you could not deny that. Did you mean by this answer that you could affirm that such action took place?

A "hat I said was that I could not deny the fact that KIDO has heard from HARADA the alleged facts conteined in court exhibit 179-F, an entry from KIDO's diary. That is because I don't know the source of KIDO's information.

In other words, you don't know whether that was true or not, but not having any knowledge you can't

10

4

6

7

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

either affirm or deny? Is that the effect of your answer?

A Yes.

Now, there was one other question Nr. Logan asked you that you started to make an explanation as to the reason for your statement. Do you care to continue any more on that?

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, when this cuestion was raised there was no issue as to the contents of that diary entry. It was not raised in the affidavit originally; it was injected by the witness on cross-examination. It was a voluntary statement as to the correctness or incorrectness of whether or not there was such a statement made by KIDO in his diary. But the contents of it have never been in issue.

THE PRESIDENT: If necessary we will hear you after lunch. Captain Brooks.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Reichers & Yelden

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

KUNIAKI KOISO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. BROOKS: In regard to the question we were arguing just before adjournment, I wish to withdraw the question we were arguing as I have examined the record of proceedings for this morning's session and I find that the witness has already answered that he denied the facts set forth in exhibit 179-F as to such a meeting or plan, which I had overlooked.

However, I do desire to call the Court's attention that a substantial correction of the translations of exhibit 179-F and page 1927 of the record was made by the Language Arbitration Board at court record, page 21,340.

I understand that Mr. Caudle, SHIRATORI's counsel, wishes to make a statement in relation to the questions of this morning.

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: May it please the Tribunal, I have gone over the questions submitted to me by Mr. SHIRATORI to be asked the witness, General KOISO. At the lunch hour I discussed the questions with Mr. SHIRATORI and then we both decided they were not

pertinent to the issue, and so I do not desire to question the witness.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Witness, are there any other corrections or matters which you have not fully explained which you desire to cover at this time?

THE WITNESS: There are none.

MR. BROOKS: Does the Court or prosecution care for any other questions?

COLONEL FIXEL: The prosecution has no further questions.

MR. BROOKS: Does the Court have any questions, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness be excused -returned to the dock?

THE PRESIDENT: He will resume his place in the dock.

> (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, we will

20

21

22

23 24

now call as our next witness, TOKUGAWA, Yoshichika.

1

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 YOSHICHIKA TOKUGAWA, called as a

witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. BROOKS: This witness has testified previously, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, so I thought. You are still on your former oath although you have taken a fresh one.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

document 2043.

Please state your name and address.

My name is TOKUGAWA, Yoshichika. My present place of residence is Mejiro-machi, Toshima-ku, Tokyo.

MR. BROOKS: I ask that the witness be shown defense document 2043.

- Is this your affidavit and have you signed it? Q
- This is my affidavit and I have signed it. A
- Are the contents thereof true and correct? Q
- The contents are true and correct. A

MR. BROOKS: I now offer in evidence defense

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this affidavit on the ground that it is repetitive. This witness, when he testified before the Tribunal, was cross-examined at length on the same subjects that appear in the present affidavit. His cross-examination is found at pages 1443 to 1449 of the record.

If the Tribunal desires, counsel can point out to the Tribunal the specific subjects that are contained in the present affidavit and where they appear in the original cross-examination.

MR. BROOKS: This affidavit is offered to clarify certain points regarding KOISO and the March Incident and to lay the basis for a motion to strike exhibit 158, court record page 1440. In the certificate to exhibit 158 it is stated by the prosecution's witness, Jerry Sumiyoshi, that exhibit 158 was read to this witness in Japanese. On court record page 1440, lines 13 and 14, in answer to the prosecutor's question, this witness stated that this affidavit was not read to him in Japanese. Again on page 1443 of the record on cross-examination the witness again stated that he had not read the Japanese text of the affidavit and goes on to state on line 22 of that page that he could not tell whether the translation was

correct or incorrect because he didn't hear it in Japanese, thereby impeaching the prosecution's own witness to the certificate and making said exhibit valueless, for as shown by the cross-examination at that time and as further clarified in his present affidavit, defense document 2043, the statements made in exhibit 158 were not true and correct and this affidavit clarifies all these points for he has had the opportunity to read and compare both the Japanese and English texts.

Therefore, on the basis of the present affidavit we will ask the Court to consider a motion to strike exhibit 158 and to strike the matter relating thereto as set out beginning on court record page 1440. The presentation of this affidavit will save considerable time in examining over these matters and it has been thoroughly understood as the affidavit will speak for itself if the Court will examine the first few paragraphs.

THE PRESIDENT: His examination is rather peculiar. This appears at page 1443:

"Q Mr. "itness, you have just said that you have not read the Japanese text of this affidavit, is that correct?

"A I can't hear you very well. Please

repeat it.

1 2

3

5

6

8

10

12

13

15

17

19

20

22

23

25

"Q You have said that you did not read the Japanese text of the affidavit, is that true?

A Yes, it is. Yes, it is true. I didn't hear it in Japanese."

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, also on page 1440 of the record under the direct examination of Mr. Helm, the question: "Was this affidavit read to you in Japanese?" "No, it was not."

MR. SUTTON: May I call the Court's attention --

MR. BROOKS: And that in the face of the certificate attached to exhibit 158 which impeaches their own witness.

Since the original of this was in English, which the witness thought he understood, why, I say, that since it is apparent from the cross-examination set out in this affidavit that I am offering now, I think this matter can be cleared up and that previous errors and misstatements can be cleared up so that no damage will be done and save a lot of time. My motion to strike that, of course, goes since the affidavit read to the Tribunal is under a false certificate as their own witness has testified, their own affiant, on direct examination and

cross-examination.

2

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

22

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: He said he read it in English and that the statements in English were true. What more do we want? And he was crossexamined fully.

MR. BROOKS: That is explained in the present affidavit being offered, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Anyway, we have heard the Japanese translation of what was read in court in English, as I am reminded.

MR. BROOKS: And that explains his answers on cross-examination which are diametrically opposed to everything in the other affidavit, your Honor, and in the affidavit I am offering--

THE PRESIDENT: You can rely on that crossexamination. There is really no occasion for a fresh affidavit. No Member of the Court thinks so, at all events.

MR. BROOKS: If the Court please, I would like to be heard further on that because of the reason of an objection being made at the time that we could not -- the Japanese counsel who was cross-examining could not understand what questions to ask the witness because he couldn't read the English and I was foreclosed from examining because at that

time the rule was that only one counsel could examine.

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid we are all against you, Captain Brooks. The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. BROOKS: May I further examine this witness then, your Honor, as to the falsity of the affidavit which you have on record, which does not have a proper certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no finding on the value of the certificate by the Tribunal, which alone makes findings. The grounds for excluding the further affidavit, or the affidavit, are also the grounds for not hearing you further.

MR. BROOKS: I ask the Court then to consider a motion to strike the exhibit, 158, since we have the witness on the stand, who says it is not his affidavit and that it is not correct, and I am willing to prove it.

THE PRESIDENT: The application is refused.

MR. BROOKS: I understand you have no further use for this witness then?

THE PRESIDENT: None. The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BROOKS: I would like to have for the

record, your Honor, defense document 2043 marked for identification only to show a proffer of proof and an attempt to disprove a false affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Provision has already been made to list rejected documents and for stating the reasons for such rejection and for including them in the record.

MR. BROOKS: I am applying under that provision.

THE PRESIDENT: It operates automatically.

MR. BROOKS: I would like this one given an exhibit number, your Honor, because I intend to argue this later, for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: You can have anything marked for identification.

Mark it for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2043 will receive exhibit No. 3384 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3384 for identification only.)

MR. BROOKS: We now offer for identification only the official regulations dealing with the organization of the War Ministry from 1920 to 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: There is "Exhibit 74" noted

against this, Captain Brooks. MR. BROOKS: That is a little further on, your Honor. 3 CLERK OF THE COURT: "War Ministry General 4 Affairs Regulations" will receive exhibit No. 3385 for identification only. (Whereupon, the document above 7 referred to was marked defense exhibit 8 No. 3385 for identification only.) MR. BROOKS: Defense document 2562, which is 10 an excerpt therefrom, is offered in evidence. 11 12 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 13 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2562 14 will receive exhibit No. 3385-A. 15 (Whereupon, the document above 16 referred to was marked defense exhibit 17 No. 3385-A and received in evidence.) 18 19

20

21 22

23 24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

MR. BROOKS: This document is offered for the purpose of showing that the Defendant KOISO was not responsible for the control of the Army budget while Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau but that the Chief of the Intendance Bureau was responsible for control of the budget during this period of time and that it was only after later revisions that the regulations were amended and revised and a new clause inserted making control of the general budget part of the duties of the 10 Military Affairs Bureau. This may be seen in exhibit 74 which is a 1942 revision and by reference to the witness' testimony especially at record page 27717, line 17 of the record, and shows that the defendant KOISO could not have controlled the expenditures relating to the Army expenses of the Manchurian Incident regardless of whether they had Imperial Sanction or not.

This excerpt shows the duties of the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau and will not be read into evidence but is offered to show that the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau did not have control of the budget but that it was under the control of the Chief of the Intendance Bureau which may be ascertained by the Tribunal's examination. Attention is called to Article 23, Sections 4, 5 and 6, and Article 24, Section 3, which bears out the above statement.

document 2560.

25

THE PRESIDENT: You don't propose to read it after that explanation? MR. BROOKS: No, sir. We next call the witness HIYOSHI, Takohiko. 5 6 TAKEHIKO HIYOSHI, called as a witness on 7 behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: 9 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. BROOKS: 12 Q What is your name and address? A My name is HIYOSHI, Takehiko. My address is 13 14 1835, 2 Chome, Nogata-cho, Nakano-ku, Tokyo. 15 MR. BROOKS: I ask that the witness be shown defense document 2560 (Revised). 17 (Whereupon, a document was handed to 18 the witness.) 19 Is this your affidavit and did you sign it? 20 A This is my affidavit and I have signed it. 21 Is it true and correct? 22 Yes. 23 ·MR. BROOKS: We now offer in evidence defense 24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 3, being lines 4 and 5 on page 3, beginning with the words, "the expenditures". Objection is also made to the last sentence in the next to the last paragraph on page 3, beginning with the word "therefore", and to the entire last paragraph of the affidavit on the grounds that these are statements of opinion and conclusions.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please -THF PRESIDENT: KOISO is allowed to say somethink like that.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please --

THE PRESIDENT: It is rather petty. Still I wouldn't say they weren't exactly sound objections.

MR. BROOKS: I will agree to the first correction of the last sentence of the first paragraph of page 3, "The expenditures of the funds were thus made justly." That should be deleted. I overlooked it.

But as this witness served under General KOISO, then Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, as an Intendance officer attached to the Control Department, Headquarters, Kwantung Army, and handled the disbursement of secret funds, this witness should be able to clarify the uses made of its secret funds by the Kwantung Army and

3

4

,

7

.

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

> 19 20

21

23

24

particularly of the 1,970,000 yen sent from the Vice-Minister of 'ar to the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army on the 27th of December, 1933. And because of his position he should have peculiar knowledge, his being in control of the expenditures, whether such could be appropriated for private use or for personal benefit of any superior officer or anyone else or whether such actually took place, and I say that these statements are statements of fact rather than opinion due to his peculiar knowledge and could be readily examined into on cross-examination.

The first sentence I do agree should be dropped. THE PRESIDENT: Well, the document is admitted on the usual terms except as to the sentence you have agreed not to read.

MR. PROOKS: Thank you.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2560 will receive exhibit No. 3386.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3386 and received in evidence.)

MR. BROOKS: I will now read from defense document 2560, exhibit 3386, omitting the formal parts:

"I graduated from the Army Intendance school in April, 1919. In December of that year I was

3

5

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

commissioned an Intendance 2nd Lieutenant.

"In August 1933, when I was a Captain, I was appointed paymaster attached to the Administrative Legartment of the Kwantung Army Headquarters.

"In August 1935 I was transferred to the Intendence Department of the Kwantung Army Headquarters.

"Later in August 1943 I was promoted to the rank of Intendence Colonel and remained so until the termination of the war.

"During the period between August 1933 and August 1935 I was paymaster of the Administrative Department of the Kwantung Army Headquarters and had charge of the accounts of the secret service funds of the Kwantung Army by order of the Vice-Chief of Staff and the Senior Adjutant under the supervision of the Chief of the Staff of the Kwantung Army. Therefore I know well how we spent the secret service funds amounting to 1,970,000 yen sent from the Vice-Minister of Var to the Chief of the Staff of the Kwantung Army on December 27, 1933.

"At that time peace and order in Manchuria had not been completely attained as yet so the Kwantung Army made efforts to establish it in accordance with the Japan Manchukuo protocol.

"Therefore, the said fund was spent for these

1 2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13 14

15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

Primarily for gethering information, for propaganda and for purchasing weapons from Chinese Bandits etc., partly spent for supplementing general expenditure, namely, for entertaining and paying wages where necessary in the execution of general business. And it was expended by Army Headquarters, the Division, the Brigade, the Independent Garrison, Kempeitai and the Special Service Office, all of whom were carrying out their duty of establishing peace and order and thus was this spent in assisting them to accomplish their respective duties. Next if we are to add the procedure for application concerning these expenditures, they were as follows:

13 14

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

23

24

Q

"As for the apportionments from the Kwantung Army Headquarters, each section of the Staff Department under the command of the Kwantung Army applied in accordance with its own decided plan, for the definite sum desired, and after the applications were in, they were assessed by the Vice-Chief and the Chief of Staff; then the Administrative Office informed the approved sum to the sections concerned.

"The units which received their notices informing them of their respective apportioned sums out
of the secret service funds were able to use them on
the responsibility of the commanding officer of each
unit. According to regulations, the expenditures were
reported through channels to higher units every month.
After examining these reports, the Kwantung Army Headquarters then reported the matter to the War Ministry.

"The reports were made with the duplicate copies of the originals and the originals were kept in custody of the units concerned.

"As to the whereabouts of the originals and duplicates sent to the War Ministry, I do not know where they are now as I was later transferred to another locality.

"Further, the disbursements of secret service funds were strictly regulated by such independent HIYOSHI

evet

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

19

21

23 24

25

systems as disbursing officers, accounting officers and inspectors of settled accounts. Therefore, it was impossible to spend it for one's private purposes or to make a profit on it because of the system itself.

"Under these circumstances, KOISO, Chief of Staff, could never have appropriated any for his own benefit, and these funds were not used in any manner as payment in reward for services of officers of the Japanese Army."

I wish also at this time to offer defense document 2661, a certificate of non-availability as to documents referred to therein. And by agreement with the prosecution the following part of the first paragraph may be deleted: "Because they were destroyed by fire or seized by the Allied Forces." And if the documents are found, your Honor, I will see that they are presented.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't know what the effect of that is, but it is admitted on the usual terms with that deletion.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2661 will receive exhibit No. 3386-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3386-A and received in evidence.)

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

IM: BROOKS: Now, may the witness see exhibit 3381-A? This is the exhibit that was introduced on KOISO's cross-examination referring to a further sum of 3,000,000 yen that was paid at a different period.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Now, Mr. HIYOSHI, having examined that document, were these the same kind of funds as mentioned in your affidavit when you are talking about the 1,970,000 yen, and were they used for similar purposes and under the same procedure as the funds were used and as you have described in your affidavit?

The funds are the same nature as the one to which I refer in my affidavit.

Mi. BROCKS: You may cross-examine.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution does not desire to cross-examine.

Mk. BROOKS: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

> THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mh. BROOKS: We will call as our next witness, IWAKURO, Takeo.

	HIDEO IW AKURO, called as a witness on
1	
2	behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
	testified through Japanese interpreters as
3	follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY LR. BROOKS:
6	Q What is your name and address?
7	A My name is IWAKURO, Hideo. I live at 789.
8	
9	Dennenchofu, 2 chome, Ota-ku, Tokyo-to.
10	MA. BROOKS: May the witness see defense
11	document 2567, revised?
12	(Whereupon, a document was handed to
13	the witness.)
14	Q Is that your affidavit and have you signed
15	it?
1	
16	A This is my affidavit, and I have signed it.
17	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
18	A Yes; true and correct.
19	MR. BROOKS: I now offer into evidence de-
20	fense document 2567.
21	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.
22	
23	MR. SUTTON: If it please the Tribunal, the
24	prosecution objects to and moves the Tribunal to
25	strike out the following portions of this affidavit:

All of Section 3 of the affidavit which

•

32,495

appears on pages 2 and 3, except the first paragraph

The reference to General TATEKAWA's mission in the second paragraph of Section 3 is, we respectfully submit, repetitive and belongs in the general phase. The statement in the rest of this section as to Japan's military equipment in 1931 is immaterial, does not prove whether or not Japan was planning aggressive war, and if it were pertinent would belong in the general phase. The last four paragraphs of this section make no reference to KOISO.

Objection is made to all of Section 4, pages of and 4 of the affidavit, on the ground that if pertinent it would belong in the general phase, and it contains nothing especially applicable to the defendant KOISO. The attitude of the leaders of the War Ministry described in the first paragraph of Section 4, what this witness learned from Colonel ANDO's address recited in the second paragraph of Section 4, and what steps this witness took to increase funds for supplies, as recited in the last paragraph of Section 4, are, we respectfully submit, quite immaterial.

Objection is made to all of Section 5, page 4, in which the witness attempts to explain and construe exhibit 230.

affidavit, are objected to on the ground that this evidence of alleged banditry and steps taken to secure peace and order, if proper, would belong in the general phase. In the last paragraph of this section the witness gives his opinions and conclusions concerning the views of the defendant KOISO, refers to his character, and then negates his discussion with the final statement that, "The Japanese enterprises showed little activity in establishing themselves."

All of the last paragraph of Section 9 of the affidavit, being that portion of Section 9 which appears on page 8, beginning with the words on the first line of page 8, "who was of the opinion" and continuing to the end of Section 9. The witness purports to give the opinion of the army commander who succeeded KOISO and then his own opinion as to the motive for action taken.

We object to the last sentence in Section 10 of the affidavit, beginning with the words, "in reply to this" and continuing to the end of the affidavit, on the ground that the letter referred to therein is not produced nor the failure to produce it properly accounted for.

q

14

16

17

Since those portions of the affidavit to which objection is not made throw such little light on the issues before the Tribunal, we respectfully submit that the affidavit should be rejected in toto.

MR. BROOKS: If the Court please, I want to 6 first point out the objection of the prosecution 7 that this material, if it does have relevance and 8 probative value, should have been introduced in the general phase and, therefore, should be excluded now, I want to submit that that is not a proper objection since the prosecution has been allowed to reopen their case and have been allowed to put in general evidence against all accused, that that right to produce other evidence should not be denied the defense while it is allowed to the prosecution.

Now, this witness was a member of the Material Procurement Mobilization Bureau of the War Ministry from March 1928 to August 1932. He was a staff officer of the Kwantung army in 1932 and 1934 during the same period that General KOISO was, and in February 1937 21 was Chief of the Military Administration Section of the Military Affairs Bureau. He is able to testify as to KOISO on the Manchurian problem, and will show that KOISO was opposed to the formation of the Tri-Partite Pact while Overseas Minister.

Duda & soratt

As to the objections of the prosecution to paragraph 3, this is in substantiation of the statement made by General KOISO himself in his affidavit while in the box, and goes to the problems dealt with by him while holding the official capacity described by him at that time. It further explains the conditions and reasons for certain other actions.

As to the objection to all of section 4, pages 3 and 4 of the affidavit, this explains definitely the actions taken while the witness and KOISO were involved with handling the Manchurian Incident upon its report. The telegrams referred to therein will be put in evidence in General MINAMI's case in a group because several defendants are relying upon the same telegrams. This statement substantiates KOISO's statement in his affidavit as to the activities and the considerations that they studied before taking any action at the time.

As to section 5, page 4, this exhibit 230 has been testified to by KOISO and the statement of this witness is in substantiation of the statements made by KOISO, as to a reply being requested, et cetera, and this officer was one of the staff officers serving with KOISO at the time and should know.

As to section 7, pages 5, 6, and 7, as to

th

by this witness, who was in the office at the time near KOISO and working with him, that such knowledge of such acts affected these public officials, as KOISO has set forth in his affidavit; that reports of banditry had to be dealt with and influenced the decisions at later periods and accounts for some of the action taken and some of the explanations given by KOISO in his affidavit. This especially substantiates KOISO's affidavit on page 6 where it discusses the labor service corps and the way this banditry was dealt with, by buying weapons and

returning them to peaceful pursuit.

affected at all.

that which is already in evidence to a large extent, and connects and ties in KOISO's case so that he can take advantage of that evidence that has been put in in general phases. The only way we can make use of the evidence in the general phase is in such a manner as this by reference to it of specific parts on specific points, and supplementing it to fit an individual case upon which sometimes other defendants would not be

As to the last paragraph of section 9 of the afficavit, being the portion appearing on page 8, beginning with the words "...who was of the opinion..." this is proper as this man was a staff officer and knew what the opinion was as it would be discussed in a staff meeting, and it states whose opinion it was and who acted upon it: the Commander of the Kwantung Army.

In the last sentence in section 10, beginning with the words "In reply to this..." the letter in that case I do not think is available. We have been making a search for it, your Honor. I do not think it is in process yet. I do not think it has been found. It may be that the Court could properly reject that part; however, as soon as I have completed bringing

,

10.5

in the affidavits of non-availability, I would ask 1 later to put this in by way of secondary evidence, 2 and I feel that this could be received at this time, subject to being disregarded if I do not show definitely 4 that it can be procuced.

That is all I have, your Honor. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton, will you kindly indicate again just what parts you object to, or check what I say.

Oh, I have them here. Yes, they are all right. I have mine marked in accordance with this.

By a majority, the Court upholds the objections and rejects the document to the extent that it is objected to.

MR. BROOKS: I take it that that is all of section 3 of the afficavit which appears on pages 2 and 3, except the first paragraph, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: There is still quite a lot left.

MR. BROOKS: And all of section 4, pages 3 and 4 of the afficavit; all of section 5 of page 4, and all of section 7, pages 5, 6 and 7; all of section 9.

> THE PRESIDENT: No; all of the last paragraph. MR. BROOKS: All of the last paragraph of

3

5

6

7 8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

section 9, beginning with the words "...who was of the opinion ... " THE PRESIDENT: That is right. 3 MR. BROOKS: And the last sentence in section 10, 4 "In reply..." Is that correct, your Honor? 5 THE PRESIDENT: That is right. 6 Call out the number, and it can be read after 7 the recess. 9 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2567 10 will receive exhibit No. 3387. 11 (Whereupon, the document above 12 referred to was marked defense exhibit 13 No. 3387 and received in evidence to the 14 extent above mentioned.) 15 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 16 minutes. 17 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 18 taken until 1500, after which the proceedings 19 were resumed as follows:) 21 22 23

4

24

starting:

L 80 0

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. MR. BROOKS: I now read defense document 2567, exhibit 3387, omitting the rejected parts. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 50 MR. BROOKS: I also omit the formal parts,

"In March 1928, I was attached to a section in the Maintenance Bureau of the War Ministry, and in August 1932 was transferred to assume the offige" --I think that should be "...on the staff of the Kwantung Army. After two years in Manchukuo, I | 81 returned and served as member of the General Staff (Headquarters), and junior secretary in the Manchurian Affairs Bureau, whereupon in February 1937 was appointed section chief for War Affairs in Military Affairs Bureau. Later in 1939, I was dispatched to the U.S.A. to assist Ambassador NOMURA. Since then I have taken several posts as regimental commander in the infantry, and at the time of termination of war was Chief Staff Officer of the 28th Army at the Burmese Front.

"2. It was since 1 August 1929 when General KOISO, then Major General, came to assume his office as Chief of Maintenance Bureau, I myself serving as

his subordinate, that I for the first time became acquainted with him. Later during the General's tenure of office as Chief Staff to the Kwantung Army, I also served therein.

"3. As Chief of Maintenance Bureau, (From August 1929 to August 1930), the General was greatly distressed then about the ill-equipment of our army and munition industry, and would repeat that it was more than necessary for Japan to avoid war by all means. General KOISO, being transferred to Bureau Chief for Military Affairs in August 1930, was confronted with the dispute between Japan and China, especially with the strained situation in connection with Manchuria."

I now skip to page 5, nexter rangraph 6:

"6. I shall state next as to the condition of peace and order in Manchukuo at the time of my assumption of post in the Kwantung Army. The order was issued, appointing me as member of staff to the Kwantung Army, on 8 August 1932. When I arrived at the Headquarters in the Totaku Building in Mukden on 26 August via Chosen and in company with Army Commander MUTO and Chief of Staff Officer KOISO, the bandits were actively carrying out underhand disturbance movements. Night trains would often be

held up, and the situation went far as to our suffering attacks by bandits at the aerodrome outside the walls of Mukden city late in September.

"In pursuance to Army Commander MUTO's intention, General KOISO as Chief Staff to the Kwantung Army directed his staff to draft policies for cooperation with Manchukuo along the following lines:

"(1) Restoration of public peace and order.

"(2) Maintenance of transport and communication.

> "(3) Development of industry." I now skip to paragraph 8 on page 7:

"8. A certain KYOWA Association (T.N. The Association of Harmony) had been organized in Manchukuo, which however tended to lapsing into a political body of a 'one party for one state' character. Pursuant to instructions of Army Commander MUTO, General KOISO advised the president of General Affairs of the Manchukuo Government to the effect that though there was no objection to maintaining it as a cultural body it would be inadvisable to encourage its growth as a political party. I understand that Army Commander MUTO had also refused the request by the said body to become an advisor."

3

6

4

9

10 11

12

13

14

20

24

I will not read the remaining two pages of the affidavit, as it is valueless without that part rejected by the Court.

I would like the witness to be shown court exhibit 230.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

BY MR: BROCKS (Continued):

Q Have you ever seen this document before?

A Yes, I have.

Q When and where?

A In Manchuria. The time was, I think, in the fall of 1933.

Q And what was the circumstance?

A When an examination of the contents were made when the document was received.

Q Will you tell the Tribunal what this document -- I withdraw that.

Did you receive any request from the Central Army in Tokyo -- Central Army Authorities -- or from any official government department in Tokyo, as to the matter contained in this exhibit?

A It is my understanding that this document, which originated in Tokyo and was formulated in Tokyo, was transmitted to the Kwantung Army to obtain its

2

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

21

23

24

opinion.

Q Where was this draft policy originated in Tokyo; what department?

A I think this plan was formulated in the General Staff Headquarters and from there, when the plan had been drawn up, sent to the War Ministry and the War Ministry forwarded it to the Kwantung Army for the purpose of obtaining its opinion.

Q This information contained in this Court exhibit 230 was as a result of a study of some agency. Can you state who studied and whose opinions are expressed in this document?

A It cannot be definitely known as to who formulated the draft of this plan in Tokyo.

Q Just a minute.

A Whoever made the plan was received in the field, that is, in Manchuria.

Q I am not referring to Tokyo. I will withdraw that question and ask this one: Is there any significance in the exhibit you have before you, in that the same name -- that is dispatched in the name of the Chief of Staff?

A The name "KOISO, Kuniaki, Chief of Staff" appearing on this document, appears there only in accordance with regulations governing the handling of

docu

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

18

19

terms.

20

22

23

25

documents and does not mean that the name appearing thereon is responsible for the contents of the documents.

Q You mean for the origination of the documents.

A Not as to who originated or formulated the document, but where the document originated or came from, that is, the name of the office.

Q Was this a customary procedure for handling documents -- administrative procedure?

A Yes.

MR. BROOKS: You may cross-examine.

MR. SUTTON: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution does not desire to cross-examine this witness.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness be released then?
THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BROOKS: We call as our next witness KITANO, Kenzo. KFNZO KITANO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, 5 testified through Japanese interpreters as 6 follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BROOKS: Q What is your name and present address? 10 A My name is KITANO, Kenzo; my address is 11 No. 29, Goban-cho, City of Hikone, Chiba Prefecture. 12 13 IR. BROOKS: May the witness be shown 14 defense document 2561. 15 (Whereupon, a document was handed 16 to the witness.) 17 Is that your affidavit and have you signed 18 it? 19 This document was written by me and signed A 20 by me. 21 Q Is it true and correct? 22 I made a mistake in the number of the 23 division -- the division number toward the end of 24 the affidavit. 25 Point it out, plaase.

2

3

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A Where the affidavit reads, "the 20th Division," third line from the end of the affidavit, it should read, "the 19th Division."

With that correction, is it true and correct?

A Yes.

MR. BROOKS: I offer into evidence defense document 2561, and, if the Court please, I would like to also offer at the same time defense document 2698, a certificate of non-availability of certain documents referred to therein, with the understanding that, by agreement with the prosecution, we will delete the last two lines of the first and second paragraphs of the certificate, defense document 2698.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted, with that deletion, on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2561 will receive exhibit No. 3388.

Defense document 2698 will receive exhibit No. 3388-A.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked defense exhibit No. 3388 and defense exhibit No. 3388-A, respectively, and received in evidence.)

MR. BROOKS: I will now read defense document 2561, exhibit No. 3388, omitting the formal

6

19

21

22

--

24

parts, commencing with paragraph 2:

March, 1938 (the 13th year of Showa) to September, 1939 (the 14th year of Showa). The commander of the Army at that time was General KOISO, until July 15, 1938 (the 13th year of Showa) when he was succeeded by General NAKAMURA.

"3. As for Commander KOISO's intentions

the Korean Army as a major-general from early in

"2. I held the post of Chief of Staff of

and actions prior to the outbreak of the Changkufeng Incident, I will depose as follows:

"A The Commander of the Korean Army in

"A. The Commander of the Korean Army in 1938 (the 13th year of Showa) had no operational duties but was only charged with the duty of defending Korea. He was not invested with any wartime duties. He was therefore, as it were, a commander of a caretaker army.

"As regards the two divisions in Korea, the command of the Army Commander was confined to the defense of Korea and, so far as the duty of wartime operations was concerned, the Chief of the General Staff was directly in charge. At the time of the Changkufeng Incident, the 20th Division was in North China, so the only field division in Korea was the 19th Division.

1

KITANO

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

"B. Such being the case, the troops under its command were constantly required to absolutely keep from exciting the Soviet Army. Especially since the China Incident was then in progress, were they warned to be extremely cautious as any dispute outbreak with the Soviet Union would be an obstacle in carrying out the policy of the central authorities towards China.

"Again the likes of watch-post line of our border guards were laid, within our territory of defense back from the frontier line in many places."

I think that should be, "the hikes of watchpost line," I don't know. It doesn't make sense there.

"On the occasion of inspections or observations, they were done at the spot of the watch-post line or at the headquarters of units, never going close to the frontier line. Such being the case, it was the principle for all troops from the Army Commander down to do their utmost not to excite the Soviet. Therefore, such an attempt as to invade Soviet territory was quite out of the question and was impossible from the standpoint of military strength.

"I remember, as a result, I presented the telegraphic instructions from the Central Authorities 4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to General NAKAMUDA, Kotaro, the succeeding Army
Commander, who arrived at Seoul on July 17 and asked
the new commander for necessary instructions, and
measures were made for the troops under his command.

"As stated above, Korean Army orders to units of parts of the 19th Division relative to the Soviet-Manchurian frontier dispute were given by General NAKAMURA, the new Army Commander, and had nothing to do with General KOISO."

In relation to the matter of the Changkufeng Incident, I would like for the Court to consider the testimony of TANAKA, Ryukichi, at record pages 22,742, 22,743, and 22,751, and would submit that the conclusion of the witness, though being practical under the circumstances, was not in accordance with fact.

You may cross-examine.

MR. SUTTON: No cross-examination.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness be released?

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual

terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

22

24

n 1 a 2 p 3 & 4 K a 5 p 6 a 1 8

K

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, on this exhibit 3388, on page 2, under paragraph B, the tenth line from the bottom, I will have to ask the Language arbiter to check the Japanese translation and give us a proper word. He said "likes" and it may be "hikes" or something else.

THE PRESIDENT: It may mean "things such as."

MR. BROOKS: We call as our next witness

TOKUGAWA, Yoshitomo.

10

11

12

13

14

15

9

YOSHITOMO TOKUGAWA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

Q State your name and address.

A My name is TOKUGAWA, Voshitomo. My address is No. 41, 4-chome, Mejiro, Toshimaku, Tokyo.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness see defense document 2563, revised?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Is that your affidavit and have you signed

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

-it?

 	-	-			

A Yes.

O Is it true and correct?

A Yes, the contents are true and correct.

MR. BROOKS: We now offer in evidence
defense document 2563.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2563

will receive exhibit No. 3389.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3389 and received in evidence.)

MR. BROOKS: I now read defense document 2563, exhibit No. 3389, omitting the formal parts.

"After finishing a middle school course I went over to England to study and stayed there from 1931 to 1934.

"Since 1935 I have been a part-time employee of the Imperial Museum.

"I was on the special staff of the Overseas Vinistry from April 1939 till August 1939 and from January 1940 till July of the same year.

"And from 1940 I have been a part-time commissioner of the Nyukoen, a relief institution attached to the Ministry of Justice.

"I have also been serving in the Foreign

	A Yes.
	O Is it true and correct?
	A Yes, the contents are true and correct.
	MR. BROOKS: We now offer in evidence
defe	nse document 2563.
	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2563
will	receive exhibit No. 3389.
	(Whereupon, the document above
	referred to was marked defense exhibit
	3389 and received in evidence.)
	MR. BROOKS: I now read defense document 2563
· exhi	bit No. 3389, omitting the formel parts.
	"After finishing a middle school course I
went	over to England to study and stayed there from
1931	to 1934.
	"Since 1935 I have been a part-time employee
of t	he Imperial Museum.
	"I was on the special staff of the Overseas
Fini	stry from April 1939 till August 1939 and from
Janu	ary 1940 till July of the same year.
	"And from 1940 I have been a part-time
comm	issioner of the Nyukoen, a relief institution

attached to the Ministry of Justice.

"I have also been serving in the Foreign

Affairs Bureau of the Japanese Red Cross from 1945 until now.

3

1

"I should like to make a statement concerning the conversation between General KOISO and German Ambassador Mr. Ott.

4 5

"I had many acquaintances at the embassies and legations of various countries in Japan.

6

"Ambassador Ott was one of my acquaintances and I met him quite often.

9

10

8

"I remember that around the middle of June, when I met Ambessador Ott, he requested an appointment to see Overseas Minister KOISO.

11 12

> "Just at that time, as I was on the special staff of the Overseas Ministry, I conveyed his request

14 15

13

to Overseas Minister KOISO.

16 17

18

19

"But General KOISO's answer was this: that he himself was not interested in an interview with Ambassador Ott, but if the latter wished to see him, he should comply.

20

21

"Therefore, I exerted myself to make arrangement for their meeting on the 20th of June of the same vear.

22 23

"However, as it was the first time for them to see each other, their conversation was very short only about thirty minutes.

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

124

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0

"I was an interpreter between them, and the Ambassador talked almost all the time explaining his opinion to the Overseas "inister that the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact would be advantageous to Japan, and further, the Ambassador went on that Japan would be able to gain economic advantages in French Indo-China and Netherland Fast Indies as the result of the conclusion of the Pact. Overseas Minister KOISO listened to the Ambassador in silence for the most part, neither acknowledging nor denying the Ambassador except asking only a few questions."

You may examine.

MR. SUTTON: No cross-examination.

MR. BROOKS: I'ay the witness be released on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual terms.

(Thereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BROOKS: There were some corrections in that, if your Fonor please, and they appear on an errata sheet, which I think has been distributed.

"'e will call as our next witness TANAKA, Takeo.

23 24

TAKEO TANAKA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

o "hat is your name and present address?

A My name is TANAKA, Takeo. My present address is No. 2956 Kichijaji, Musashino City, Tokyo.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness see defense document 2564?

("Thereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

This was incorrectly numbered defense document 2121 in some copies, your Monor, if there is any confusion.

- 1 Is this your affidavit and have you signed it?
 - A This is my affidavit.
 - o Is it true and correct?
 - A Yes, true and correct.

MR. BROOKS: "e now offer defense document 2564 into evidence with the exception of numbered paragraph 7, on page 12, which we feel may come under the Court's ruling against character evidence. "We will not read that.

2

3

5

6

7

8

à

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

MR. SUTTON: The prosecution objects to this affidavit in its entirety. It contains primarily the conclusions and opinions of this witness and contains statements so involved that their meaning cannot be understood and other alleged statements of fact which could not have been within the purview of the knowledge of this witness. The affidavit is argumentative and repetitive. We desire to especially point out the

In Section 1, pages 2 - 4 of the affidavit, the witness seeks, as stated near the bottom of page 2, to elucidate KOISO's attitude on two questions -- the Tripartite Alliance and southern expansion.

In the second paragraph of this section, at the top of page 3, the witness purports to give the private opinion of KOISO.

In the third paragraph of Section 1, being the second paragraph on page 3, the statement by the witness of the views privately expressed by KOISO to the Premier and the Foreign Minister are statements of facts which could not have been within the knowledge of this witness and this paragraph contains an argument on the views and opinions of KOISO.

In Section 2 of the affidavit, pages 4 - 6, the witness purports to describe the state of mind of

following objections:

KOISO. This section is written sometimes in the singular and sometimes in the plural. Whether the parts of this section under A and B on pages 5 and 6 are statements of the witness or of KOISO, or quotations from some other source, it is impossible to tell.

Division A of Section 2 on page 5 purports to be a quotation of principles, but the source is not given.

In the first part of Section 2 on page 4 and in the first paragraph of Division A of Section 2 on page 5, the pronouns "we" and "us" are used; for example, in the eighth line of Section 2 on page 4, "made us feel," in the twelfth line of page 4, "not only were we deeply impressed," in the fourteenth line of page 4, "our ears," and in the first paragraph of Division A of Section 2 on page 5 the following expressions appear:

"We are now defeated," and "We have, of course, an eager desire." Near the end of the second paragraph of Division A, section 2, page 5, the third person "he" is used -- "He felt confident." There is no way of ascertaining to whom these pronouns refer.

In Division B of Section 2, pages 5 - 6, which begins with quotation marks, the third person "he" is used. It is impossible to tell from whom this is quoted.

Near the end of the first paragraph on page 6

1 2

**

- 6

of Section 2, the witness purports to give the thoughts, intentions and hopes presumably of KOISO.

Section 4, pages 8 - 11, contains opinions and conclusions of the witness and is argumentative. The first paragraph of this section on page 9 purports to be a quotation, but the source is not given. The last two paragraphs of this section at the bottom of page 10 and the top of page 11 are especially argumentative.

"Section 5 on page 11 is objected to as argumentative, repetitive and irrelevant in that the witness purports to give the contents of and tries to explain the meaning of a speech made by KOISO. This speech is set out in full in exhibit 277, record pages 3703 - 3717.

The last sentence of Section 6 at the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12 is pure speculation.

In Section 7, page 12 --

THE PRESIDENT: You need not deal with that.

MR. SUTTON: It is respectfully submitted that there is so little of this affidavit which is free from objection that it should be rejected in toto.

MR. BROOKS: If I may refer to my notes:

The prosecution has not brought out that this witness was the Vice Minister of Overseas Affairs under KOISO, and also served as Chief Secretary of the Cabinet

1 2

when KOISO was Prime Minister, and his testimony as to
KOISO's attitude toward the southern region problem, as
to the circumstances surrounding the formation of the
KOISO Cabinet, and to the administrative policies of the
KOISO Cabinet are from his own knowledge and discussions
with the accused. He will testify here to KOISO's
efforts to terminate the war and to the circumstances
following these efforts, leading to KOISO's resignation.

He will testify as to KOISO's authority regarding prisoners of war and give evidence showing the lack of responsibility for death and mistreatment of internees and prisoners of war.

As to the pronouns to which the prosecution has taken objection, none of these objections can fail to be corrected, if there is any doubt, by proper cross-examination. In reading it, when you take into consideration that this witness was a vice-minister and is talking about his superior, the minister, I do not see how there can be any doubt as to who he is talking about when he says "we."

Taking the objections up section by section:

Section 1, pages 2 and 4 of the affidavit.

I think that the vice-minister could well testify on
the views of the minister in relation to these matters.

If he did not know the views, then he would not be

.

17

11

13

15

16

19

21

22 23

24

carrying out his proper duties as a vice-minister.

THE PRESIDENT: HORINOUCHI did that, but perhaps in clearer terms -- Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs.

MR. BROOKs: That may be, your Honor, but in this instance the witness has set out the matters that were discussed at their private conferences, and I have endeavored to lay before the Court the private opinions expressed by the general to his vice-minister on his state of mind at that time, what caused him to act and how he acted.

If these questions were apparent here, from which these answers were received, I don't think one of them could be objected to. Being in affidavit form, rather than question and answer form, it does give them a different flavor at times, but I do not think that relevant and probative evidence should be rejected for the want of having the questions clearly understood that could produce the same effect.

As to the other sections objected to, I think if the position of this witness and the accused is considered, that alone would answer the objection in that any necessary steps may be taken by way of crossexamination to prevent the Court from being misled.

As to the objection to the last sentence of

7 8

Section 6 at the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12, I agree that that might be speculation. However, it was offered in this affidavit on the strength of the witness' own knowledge that, as vice-minister, as far as he knew, he was ignorant of such conditions.

As to Section 5 on his speech in the 85th session of the Diet, it is clear from my examination of the witness, and I thought from this affidavit, that he had discussed this matter with KOISO, knew the contents of the speech, and was competent to testify thereabout.

I have no further answers.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you agree to strike out two passages at the end of the affidavit. As to the balance, we seem to think it is a case of reject all or admit all. Here and there there are statements which we could hardly accept. Any statement of opinion must be rejected. He is trying to tell us, apparently, the attitude of the accused.

MR. BROOKs: That was the purpose, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: With some hesitation the majority have decided to accept the affidavit. We sincerely hope there will not be many more of these affidavits, because they could be expressed clearly so far as they could be admitted.

Except the parts agreed to by Captain Brooks

not to be pressed, the document is admitted on the usual terms. It may be read in the morning.

We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 6 November 1947, at 0930.)